29th January 1931]

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I think the hon. the Home Member admitted yesterday that one medical man went there actually to render first aid. May I know whether the Government will revise the answer to clause (*a*) ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" The information which the Government received is that that medical man was one of the members of that assembly."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I ask whether the Government will revise their opinions after the proposed enquiry is made ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" On the points referred to in the pamphlet."

Issue of prohibitory orders on the picnic party at Peddapuram.

* 184-F Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any prohibitory orders were served upon the gentlemen who attended the picnic party at Peddapur on 21st December 1930 and the doctors who went to render medical aid to the injured ; and

(*b*) if so, under what section of the law and by whom the orders were issued, when and upon whom they were served and whether a copy of the order or orders will be placed on the table of the House ?

A.—(*a*) No. No doctors went to Peddapuram to render any medical aid.

(*b*) The question does not arise.

Enquiry into the Peddapur lathi charge.

* 184-G Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have inquired into the legality and necessity of the Peddapur incident of the 21st December 1930 and what action they have taken or propose to take against the excesses committed by the Police authorities in the said incident ; and

(*b*) whether details of the enquiry and the action taken will be placed on the table of the House ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have perused the reports of the officers concerned and a summary has been given in the reply to clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of question No. 230. The Government see no reason to question the legality or the necessity of the action taken. They are satisfied that the Police were not guilty of any excesses and no further action is proposed to be taken in respect of the incident.

Alleged lathi charge on a picnic party at Peddapuram.

* 184-H Q.—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether he is aware of the lathi charge by the police on people who were taking tea at a picnic party held in a garden at Peddapuram ;

(b) what was the object of the Police in raiding a picnic party;

(c) who were the Police officers that headed the raiding party of policemen armed with lathis;

(d) whether the Circle Inspector of Police of Peddapuram was one of them;

(e) whether the Inspector of Police of Pithapuram was one of the officers;

(f) whether the Police officers asked the party engaged in taking tea to disperse;

(g) if so, the reasons for so doing;

(h) whether the guests and hosts at the picnic party duly obeyed the order to disperse;

(i) whether, even then, the Police beat them, including the ladies, with lathis and firewood;

(j) whether all the policemen engaged in this lathi charge were wearing their uniform; how many of them were without uniform;

(k) whether the District Superintendent of Police was a member of the lathi charge party; if he was not there, whether he was aware of this lathi charge before it was conducted and whether it was conducted with his permission; and

(l) whether it is a fact that a motor-car belonging to one of the guests was badly damaged by the Police and that the Superintendent of Police disapproved of this act and has agreed to get it repaired at Government cost?

A.—(a), (b), (c), (f), (g) & (h) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clauses (a) and (b) of Question No. 230.

(d) The Government have no information.

(e) Yes.

(i) The assembly was dispersed by force only after the women present had withdrawn in accordance with the Deputy Superintendent's request.

(j) The Government have no reason to suppose that the Police were not in uniform.

(k) No. The District Superintendent of Police was absent from Headquarters at the time of the incident.

(l) Two of the three motor cars left behind were damaged but not badly. One of these cars had one tyre cut and the windscreen and headlight glasses broken; the other had its hood-glass broken. Such damage as was done to the glasses of these cars was incidental to the dispersal of the unlawful assembly, some members of which were sheltering among the cars. The cutting of the tyre could not have been caused by a lathi and was in all probability the work of a hostile crowd of villagers who resented the selection of Peddapuram as the meeting place for the so-called garden party.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"The Government say in answer to question No. 230 that the Deputy Superintendent of Police proceeded to the place and found that it was a meeting and that somebody was reading from a cyclostyled paper appealing for boycott of foreign cloth. May I know whether the Government seized those papers?"

29th January 1931]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think they are with the police."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"It is stated in clause (i) that the women present withdrew. May I enquire then why Mrs. Kameswaramma was charged with lathis?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"As she was getting into the motor car, accidently she received a lathi blow. She herself admits it. It is a pure accident."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"The Government say they have no information whether the Circle Inspector of Police of Peddapuram was there. In clause (e) it is stated that the Inspector of Police of Pithapuram was one of them. In clause (k) it is stated that the District Superintendent of Police was absent from headquarters. May I know why the Government have no information about the Circle Inspector of Police of Peddapuram?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I shall look into the matter."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"With reference to answer (1), may I enquire why people who took shelter in the car should be charged with lathis?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I shall call for the information."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I ask if it is not the duty of the hon. Member to place such information on the table of the House?"

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"What is the meaning of beating people when they are running away? The idea is that the assembly should disperse. Why should people be beaten while they are dispersing?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I do not think they were beaten when they were running away. Lathi charges were made and when people resisted, they received blows."

Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"When people got among motor cars, it means they were trying to disperse; then why should the motor cars be attacked and damaged?"

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I ask why the only outlet was blocked by the police lorry?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir; there were other exits."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"This outlet was blocked by the police lorry?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"It was not so."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"When did this hostile crowd of villagers come in the first instance? Were they present before the police arrived there?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The people of the locality were hostile to this assembly."

[29th January 1931

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Were the villagers present before the police appeared?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— "I have no information."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"May I enquire whether that garden was not two miles away from the town?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— "Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"Then why did the police fear that that assembly was a danger to public safety or peace?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"They were concerting measures to obstruct the ordinary administration of the Government."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Granting that, how is it illegal? Had the Government promulgated section 144 there?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— "It was not necessary. The police have got power under sections 127 and 128 of the Criminal Procedure Code."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"May I know if the hon. Member is sure that the police officers had no sharp weapons in their possession, with which they could have cut the tyres?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— "Yes."

Civil Justice

Removal of the bar of 13 years' service for increments to Sub-Judges.

*185 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) how many of the District Munsifs have sent memorials to Government asking for a modification of G.O. No. 2264, Law (General), dated the 14th September 1922;

(b) whether the High Court has recommended the removal of the time-limit of 13 years of permanent service as a District Munsif imposed by the said Government Order for an acting Sub-Judge to draw increments; and

(c) whether the Government have considered this matter and arrived at any decision?

A.—(a) Six District Munsifs.

(b) The High Court recommended that instead of 13 years of permanent service a continuous service of 15 years after appointment as a District Munsif, whether acting or permanent, might be fixed as a condition for earning increments in the time-scale of pay allowed for Sub-Judges.

(c) Government have considered the proposal and have dropped it for the present owing to financial stringency.

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR :—"May I ask whether the Government were made aware by a memorial of the Judicial Officers that the Government Order is ultra vires it having been passed when the Fundamental Rules were in force?"